

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/442,343	TURNER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Milan S Kapadia	3626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Milan S Kapadia. (3) _____.

(2) Michael McNeil (Reg. NO.35949). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 January 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moshfeghi et al (6,236,972).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


DINH X. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant contacted Examiner regarding Office Action mailed on 1/21/03. Applicant was concerned that Examiner had not addressed all the arguments presented in the Applicant's response to the first Office Action. In particular, that the Examiner had not addressed Applicant's argument that Moshfeghi teaches away from a newly added limitation. Examiner responded by citing MPEP section 2145, which stated the requirements needed in order for a reference to teach away from a claimed invention. The Examiner further discussed where in Office Action mailed on 1/21/03 this issue was addressed.

Faxed a copy of this Interview
Summary to Applicant's Representative
on 28 January 2003.